UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,800	02/04/2000	David Angelo Ferrucci	YO999-202	7920

21254   7590   02/19/2004

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/497,800		FERRUCCI ET AL.
	Examiner		**Art Unit**
	Doug Hutton		2178

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 January 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>26-32,36 and 37</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25 and 33-35</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 February 2000</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I in Paper No. 6 is

acknowledged.

Claims 26-32, 36 and 37 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37

CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic

or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 6.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: the "swapping" that is performed by the reconciler (Claim

22, Line 2).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

o the term "a" should be inserted between the terms "be" and "component" on

Page 4, Line 13 so that the sentence reads more clearly;

o the phrase "mapped variable A from the document component's (e.g., reference

numeral 12) variable 1 in the container assembly 11" on Page 13, Lines 12-14

should be amended to — mapped document variable A to container variable 1 —
so that the sentence reads more clearly;

- the phrase "mapped variable B to variable 3 (of the document component 12) in
  the container assembly 11 (e.g., containing document)" on Page 13, Lines 20-22
  should be amended to — mapped component variable B to container variable 3
  — so that the sentence reads more clearly;

- the phrase "by the user by the system displaying component variables" on Page
  16, Line 21 should be amended to — by the user. The system displays
  component variables — so that it reads more clearly;

- the phrase "allows since" on Page 20, Line 21 should be amended to indicate
  what the "automatic reconciler" allows; this appears to be a typographic error;
  and

- the first sentence on Page 21 does not express a complete thought and should
  be amended.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show
every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "displaying a
component variable next to a representation of an element in a domain model of the

document" (Claim 18, Lines 3-4) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 11 (Page 12, Line 19) and 17 (Page 12, Line 20).

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "of these variables" in Line 4 should be amended to — component variable — in order to specify that the "variable" is a "component variable";

- the phrase "variable in said container" in Lines 4-5 should be amended to — container variable — so that the claim reads more clearly;

- the phrase "an identification occurs" in Line 6 should be amended to — there is a container variable that refers to the same domain concept as a component variable — because describing this step of the method as an "identification" is inaccurate;

- the phrase "variable in the component" in Line 6 should be amended to —

  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly; and

- the phrase "variable in the container" in Line 7 should be amended to —

  container variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "with said best identity match found to *said element* in *said domain

  model*" in Lines 1-2 refers to an "element" and a "domain model" that are not

  previously mentioned in the claims; Applicant can obviate this object by making

  Claim 3 dependent upon Claim 2; and

- the term "variable" in Line 3 should be amended to — element — because that is

  how it is previously identified (Line 2).

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "once" in Line 2 should be amended to — after — so that the claim

  reads more clearly;

- the phrase "variable in the component" in Line 2 should be amended to —

  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly;

- the term "assuming" in Line 2 should be amended to — assumes — so that the

  claim reads more clearly; and

- the phrase "variable in the containing document" in Line 3 should be amended to

  — container variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variable of the component" in Line 2 should be amended to —
  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variable in the component" in Line 1 should be amended to —
  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variables in the component" in Lines 1-2 should be amended to —
  component variables — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variable in the component" in Line 2 should be amended to —
  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variable in the component" in Line 2 should be amended to —
  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

o   the phrase *"the values"* in Line 2 should be amended to — values — because
    "values" are not previously mentioned in the claims.

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

o   the phrase *"the value"* in Line 2 should be amended to — a value — because a
    "value" is not previously mentioned in the claims.

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

o   the phrase "wherein *said user*" in Line 1 should be amended to — a user —
    because a "user" is not previously mentioned in the claims.

Applicant is advised that should Claim 1 be found allowable, Claim 17 will be
objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two
claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both
cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing
one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim.
See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities:

o   the phrase "component variables in a document" in Line 4 should be amended to
    — variables — so that it reads more clearly; in Examiner's opinion, the

"document" in this phrase *is* the "container" that is previously mentioned in the

claim; and

- the phrase "a reconciler form mapping variables in said container, with variables

  in said component" in Lines 5-6 should be amended to — a reconciler for

  mapping container variables to component variables — so that it reads more

  clearly.

Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the number "17" in Line 1 should be amended to — 19 — because the claim

  should depend from Claim 19; for purposes of examination, Examiner will

  assume that Claim 20 depends from Claim 19; and

- the phrase "said user, to perform said mapping" in Line 2 should be amended to

  — a user in order to perform a mapping — because neither a "user" not a

  "mapping" is positively previously recited in the claims.

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variable in the component" in Line 1 should be amended to —

  component variable — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "variables in said container" in Line 2 should be amended to —

  container variables — so that the claim reads more clearly; and

o   the phrase "those in said components" in Line 3 should be amended to — said

     component variables — so that the claim reads more clearly.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2, 3-7, 14, 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph,

as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one

skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make

and/or use the invention.

Claim 2:

The claim recites "determining whether the link expression can be *identified with*

an element in a domain model of the document" in Lines 3-4. The limitation fails to

enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention because the

specification fails to fully and clearly describe how the "link expression" is "identified

with" the "domain model element." One must understand this in order to make and use

the method of Claim 2.

Claim 3:

The claim recites "wherein said determining uses an automatic reconciliation algorithm to find a *best identity match*" in Lines 1-2. The limitation fails to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention because, although the specification describes the reconciliation algorithm, it fails to mention a "best identity match." One must understand what a "best identity match" is and how to configure the "reconciliation algorithm" to perform a "best identity match" in order to make and use the method of Claim 3.

Claim 18:

The claim recites "*identifying an association between the component variable and said element in the domain model*" in Lines 3-4. The limitation fails to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention because the specification fails to fully and clearly describe how the "association" between the "component variable" and the "domain model element" is "identified." One must understand this in order to make and use the method of Claim 18.

Claim 25:

The claim recites "wherein said components are built *from a same domain model*" in Lines 1-2. The limitation fails to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention because the specification fails to fully and clearly describe how

the "components" are built "from a *domain model.*" One must understand this in order

to make and use the system of Claim 25.

To obviate this rejection, Applicant should fully and clearly explain what the

"domain model" is and how it is a different part of the system from the "container" that is

recited in Claim 19. Also, Applicant should fully and clearly explain how the

"components" are "built from" the domain model.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-16, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1:

The claim recites "for each of *these variables*" in Line 4. This limitation is

indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to the "container" variables, the

"component" variables or both.

The claim also recites "if an *identification* occurs" in Line 6. This limitation is

indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to "identifying" step previously recited or

an additional "identification." If this limitation refers to an additional "identification," then

Applicant should amend the claim to particularly point out and distinctly claim this

"identification."

Applicant may obviate this rejection by amending the claim as suggested in the

above discussion under the heading "Claim Objections." For purposes of examination,

Examiner will assume that Applicant will adopt the suggested amendments.

Claim 2:

The claim recites "identifying a link expression of *said variable*" in Line 2. This

limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to the "container" variables,

the "component" variables or both.

The claim also recites "determining whether the link expression can be *identified*

with an element in a domain model of the document" in Lines 3-4. This limitation is

indefinite for several reasons. Firstly, it is unclear how the "element" that is "in a domain

model of the document" is different from the "variable" in the "container." These are the

same, in Examiner's opinion. Secondly, it is unclear how the "link expression" can be

"identified" "with an element in a domain model of the document" because the link

expression is the mapping of the "component" variable" with the "container variable."

Thus, the "link expression" *includes* the "element" that is "in a domain model of the

document" (the "container variable") and cannot be "identified" "with an element in a

domain model of the document." In Figures 3 and 5 of the drawings, Examiner sees a

"link expression" inside the "connector." However, the "domain model" and the

"elements" comprising the "domain model" are not shown in the drawings. This leads

Examiner to believe that the "domain model" is not a separate element from the

"container assembly."

Finally, Claim 2 does not correspond with Claim 1. Claim 1 already recites an "identifying" step and a "determining" step. The "identifying" and "determining" steps of Claim 2 are **not** performed *in addition to* the steps in Claim 1, but *instead of* the steps in Claim 1.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 3:

The claim recites "wherein said determining uses an automatic reconciliation algorithm to find a *best identity match*" in Lines 1-2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear what is meant by the phrase "best identity match." The specification describes the reconciliation algorithm but fails to mention the "best identity match."

Claim 7:

The claim recites "wherein said *identifying*" in Line 1. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation is referring to the "identifying" step of Claim 1 or the "identifying" step of Claim 2.

Claim 13:

The claim recites "whether the values to be assigned to the *variables*" in Line 2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to the "container" variables, the "component" variables or both.

Claim 14:

The claim recites "the value to be assigned to the *variable*" in Line 2. This

limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether it refers to a "container" variable or a

"component" variable.

Claim 18:

The claim recites "matching said element of said domain model interactively by a

user" in Line 7. This limitation is indefinite because it does not specify to what the

"element of said domain model" is "matched."

Claim 24:

The claim recites "said reconciler reconciles said variables in said document with

those in said container" in Lines 2-3. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear

how the "document variables" are different from the "container variables." These are

the same, in Examiner's opinion. In other words, the "document" *is* the "container."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-25, 33, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyce et al., Special Edition Using Microsoft Office 97, Pages 185-199 and 1017-1031, ©1997.

Claim 1:

Boyce discloses a method of reconciling component variables with container variables in a document (see Boyce, pp. 188-196 and 1020-1023), comprising:

- identifying variables in a component (when merging components from Access database into a Word "container" document, the referenced invention "identifies variables in the component" in that it analyzes the fields for each record in the Access database);

- for each of these variables, determining if there is a variable in said container that refers to a same domain concept (the referenced invention determines whether each "component variable" refers to a "same domain concept" as a "container variable" in that it analyzes the fields of each record in the Access database to see if there is a corresponding "merge field" in the Word document); and

- if an identification occurs, associating said variable in the component with said variable in the container (the referenced invention "associates" a "component variable" with a "container variable" if an "identification" occurs in that each field of a record in the Access database is matched with a "merge field" in the Word document if there is a corresponding "merge field" in the Word document).

Claim 2:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 1, further comprising:

- identifying a link expression of said variable (for an existing Word "container"

  document, when the user changes the data source and the field names of the

  records in the selected Access database do not match the "merge fields" in the

  Word document, the reference invention displays an error message; thus, the

  referenced invention "identifies" a "link expression"); and

- determining whether the link expression can be identified with an element in a

  domain model of the document (after the referenced invention displays an error

  message, the user may select a proper "merge field"; thus, the referenced

  invention "determines" whether the "link expression" can be "identified with" an

  "element in a domain model of the document").

Claim 3:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said determining uses an

automatic reconciliation algorithm to find a best identity match (the referenced invention

uses an "automatic reconciliation algorithm" to find a "best identity match" in that it

"matches" Access database variables with Word "container" document variables).

Claim 4:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 3, wherein said best identity match

comprises a direct match (the referenced invention comprises a "direct match" in that it

"directly" "matches" Access database variables with Word "container" document

variables).

Claim 5:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 3, wherein, with said best identity match

found to said element in said domain model, the variable in the component is linked with

the associated variable in the domain model (the referenced invention "links"

"component variables" with the "associated variable in the domain model" in that it

allows the user to select a proper "merge field" for the Access database variables).

Claim 6:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 5, further comprising:

- once the link is made, the variable in the component assuming a value of the

  variable in the containing document and the component variable is positioned in

  the document with the new value (the "component variable" "assumes the value"

  of the "container variable" in that it allows the user to select a proper "merge field"

  for the Access database variables).

Claim 7:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 3, wherein said identifying matches the

variable of the component to the domain model elements to find the best match (the

referenced invention "matches" the "component variable" to the "domain model

elements" to find the "best match" in that it "matches" the Access database variable with

the Word "container" document variables to "find the best match").

Claim 8:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said identifying is performed

interactively by a user (the Access database variables are "interactively identified" by a

user).

Claim 9:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 8, wherein said variable in the component

is interactively displayed adjacent to a representation of an element of the domain

model of the containing document (see Figure 51.4).

Claim 10:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 8, wherein a plurality of variables in the

component are interactively displayed adjacent to a representation of elements of the

domain model of the containing document (see Figure 51.4).

Claim 11:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said identifying comprises

actuating, by a user, a variable in the component (the referenced invention allows a

user to "actuate" a "component variable" by selecting a particular Access database as

the data source) and interactively matching the variable to an element of the domain

model (as explained in the above discussion, the referenced invention allows a user to

"interactively match" a "component variable" and a "container variable").

Claim 12:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 11, wherein said identifying is performed by

said user for each variable in the component (the referenced invention "identifies" and

"matches" each "component variable").

Claim 13:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 12, wherein said user interactively

determines whether the values to be assigned to the variables, once matched, should

be the value in the containing document or the value in the imported component when

said imported component has a value (when the user changes the data source,

"matches" the Access database variables to the Word document variables, and a Word

document variable does not correspond to an Access database variable, the referenced

invention allows the user to either change the "merge field" in the Word document or

change the "field name" in the Access database; thus, the referenced invention allows

the user to determine whether to use the "value" of the "containing document" or the

"value" of the "imported component").

Claim 14:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 3, wherein said automatic reconciliation automatically determines that the value to be assigned to the variable, once matched, is the value in the containing document (the referenced invention includes an "automatic reconciliation" that "automatically determines" that the "value" to be assigned to the "variable" in that when it "matches" Access database variables with Word "container" document variables the "values" of both variables are identical).

Claim 15:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said user, though a graphic user interface (GUI), identifies an association between said component variable and a domain model element (as explained in the rejection for Claim 2, the referenced invention allows the user to "identify an association" between the "component variable" and a "domain model element").

Claim 16:

Boyce discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said user interactively selects a container value (as explained in the rejection for Claim 13, the referenced invention allows the user to "interactively select" a "container value").

Claim 17:

This claim is rejected using the same rationale specified in the rejection for Claim

1. Boyce discloses a method that "automatically" reconciles component variables and

container variables in that the method is performed once the Word document is merged

with the components of the Access database.

Claim 18:

Boyce discloses a method of interactively reconciling component variables with

container variables in a document (see Boyce, pp. 188-196 and 1020-1023),

comprising:

- displaying a component variable next to a representation of an element in a

    domain model of the document (for an existing Word "container" document, when

    the user changes the data source and the field names of the records do not

    match the "merge fields" in the Word document, the reference invention displays

    an error message; the user can then select a proper "merge field"; thus, the

    referenced invention displays a "component variable" next to a "representation of

    an element in a domain model of the document");

- identifying an association between the component variable and said element in

    the domain model (the referenced invention identifies an "association" between

    the "component variable" and the "element in the domain model" in that the user

    selects a proper "merge field"); and

- matching said element of said domain model interactively by a user (the referenced invention "matches" the "element of the domain model" interactively in that the user interacts with a computer to select a proper "merge field").

Claim 19:

Boyce discloses a system for reconciling component variables with container variables in a document relative to a domain model (see Boyce, pp. 188-196 and 1020-1023), comprising:

- a container including a plurality of variables (the Word "container" document includes a plurality of "merge fields");
- a component having a plurality of component variables in a document (each record in the Access database has a plurality of fields); and
- a reconciler for mapping variables in said container, with variables in said component (the referenced invention includes a "reconciler" for mapping "container variables" with "component variables" in that each "merge field" in the Word document is mapped to corresponding fields of each record in the Access database).

Claim 20:

Boyce discloses the system of Claim 19, wherein said reconciler is manually controlled by said user, to perform said mapping (as indicated in the rejections for

Claims 11, 13 and 15, the reference invention discloses a "user" that "manually controls"

a "reconciler" to perform "mapping").

Claim 21:

Boyce discloses the system of Claim 19, further comprising:

o   a controller for automatically controlling said reconciler to perform said mapping

(see Figure 51.4).

Claim 22:

Boyce discloses the system of Claim 19, wherein if the variable in the component

has a value, then no swapping is performed by said reconciler.

Claim 23:

Boyce discloses the system of Claim 19, wherein said component includes a

plurality of alternative choices for being mapped by said reconciler (each record in the

Access has a "plurality" of fields for being mapped by the "reconciler").

Claim 24:

Boyce discloses the system of Claim 19, wherein when said variables in said

document have a value and said reconciler is in an on-state, said reconciler reconciles

said variables in said document with those in said container (as indicated in the

rejection for Claim 20, the reference invention discloses a "reconciler" that reconciles

"variables").

Claim 25:

Boyce discloses the system of Claim 19, wherein said components are built from

a same domain model and wherein said variables in said container are reconciled with

those in said components (as indicated in the rejection for Claim 20, the reference

invention discloses a "reconciler" that reconciles "variables").

Claim 33:

This claim is rejected using the same rationale specified in the rejection for Claim

1. Boyce discloses the same "means" for reconciling component variables with

container variables in that the method is performed by merging components of the

Access database with the Word document.

Claim 34:

This claim is for a signal-bearing medium embodying a program of machine-

readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus to perform the

method of Claim 1. Thus, it is rejected using the same rationale specified in the

rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 35:

This claim is for a signal-bearing medium embodying a program of machine-

readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus to perform the

method of Claim 18. Thus, it is rejected using the same rationale specified in the

rejection for Claim 18.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure: Popp et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,651,108; Atkinson et al., U.S.

Patent No. 5,842,018; Frank, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2001/0044813;

Atkinson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,379; and Apfel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,405,225.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-
1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00
PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)
746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-
3900.

WDH
February 6, 2004

HEATHER HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100